

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending.

### **I. Rejections Over the Prior Art:**

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of independent claim 1. As the Examiner will appreciate, should independent claim 1 be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

Claim 1 has been rejected for obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103) in light of USP 4,578,573 ("Flies") combined with USP 5,223,676 ("Yamamoto").

Claim 1 recites "electrical contacts . . . coupled to an edge of the printed circuit board, . . . wherein the electrical contacts in each row are formed from a sheet separate from the printed circuit board." The Examiner cites to Yamamoto to find this limitation lacking from Flies. However, Yamamoto does not disclose this limitation as the Examiner suggests.

Yamamoto discloses a method for forming a high-current-carrying printed circuit board (PCB). A layer used in the process (11 in Fig. 2; 19 in Fig. 3) is punched out of a sheet of metal, and is pressed together with other layers to form the completed PCB. Col. 2, l. 61 to col. 3, l. 9.

However, when finished, this layer 11 is formed on the top and bottom planar surfaces of the PCB, as clearly shown in Figures 1 and 2. This sheet is not coupled to an edge of the PCB as claimed.

In short, Yamamoto does *not* disclose "*electrical contacts . . . coupled to an edge* of the printed circuit board, . . . wherein the electrical contacts in each row are formed from a *sheet separate from the printed circuit board.*" Because the Examiner agrees that this limitation is likewise not disclosed in Flies, the result is that neither reference relied upon discloses this limitation. Accordingly, claim 1 cannot be rendered obvious by these references. See MPEP § 2143.03 (a combination of references can not establish obviousness when the combination lacks a claim limitation).

\* \* \* \* \*

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1 and 3-14 are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance issue for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Terril Lewis /

---

Terril Lewis, Reg. No. 46,065

Date: December 18, 2007

**CUSTOMER NO. 29855**

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P..  
20333 SH 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
832/446-2405  
Fax 832/446-2424